



Attachment 0029
Sections L and M
Army Contract Writing System

Solicitation Number: W52P1J-16-R-0058

Army Contracting Command – Rock
Island (ACC-RI)
Information Technology Division
Attn: Mr. Jonathan J. Anderson,
Contracting Officer
Rock Island Arsenal
3055 Rodman Avenue
Rock Island, IL 61299-8000

23 January 2017

- Final Proposal Revision, Amendment 0011
Changes highlighted in BLUE

- Amendment 0010 YELLOW highlights remain for
ease of reading

This page intentionally left blank

Revision History

Version	Date	Summary of Changes
Version 2.0	22 March 2016	Final Section L&M to be released with RFP
Version 2.01	14 April 2016	Amendment 0001
Version 2.02	06 May 2016	Amendment 0003
Version 2.03	17 May 2016	Amendment 0004
Version 2.04	20 May 2016	Amendment 0005
Version 2.05	31 May 2016	Amendment 0006
Version 3.0	11 January 2017	Amendment 0010 – Final Proposal Revision (FPR), Changes highlighted in YELLOW, see FPR Submission instructions at paragraph 3.1.1
Version 3.01	23 January 2017	Amendment 0011 – Final Proposal Revision (FPR), Changes highlighted in BLUE and are limited to instructions for IMS deletions and to correct the file date for Attachment 0015. Also, see FPR File Submission instructions at paragraph 3.1.1. Amendment 0010 YELLOW highlights remain for ease of use.

Table of Contents

SECTION L – INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS	1
L.1 ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS	1
L.2 PROPOSAL STRUCTURE INSTRUCTIONS	5
L.3 PROPOSAL FORMAT	6
L.4 INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF PROPOSAL CONTENT	20
L.4.1 Gate Criteria Submission of Attachments 0027 and 0028	20
L.4.2 Volume I: Factor 1 – Technical/Risk	20
L.4.3 Volume II: Factor 2 – Past Performance	27
L.4.4 Volume III: Factor 3 – Cost/Price	30
L.4.5 Volume IV: Factor 4 – Small Business Participation	34
L.4.6 Volume V: Contract Documentation	36
SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD	39
M.1 GENERAL	39
M.2 FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED	40
M.3 EVALUATION APPROACH	41
M.3.1 Evaluation Scope	41
M.3.2 Factor 1 – Technical/Risk	42
M.3.2.1 Sub Factor 1 – Technical Capabilities	42
M.3.2.2 Sub Factor 2 – Management Capabilities	47
M.3.3 Factor 2 – Past Performance	49
M.3.4 Factor 3 – Cost/Price	51
M.3.5 Factor 4 – Small Business Participation	52
M.4 DEFINITIONS	54
M.5 Volume V – Contract Documentation	55

SECTION L – INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

L.1 ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS

L.1.1 Proposal Submission Dates: Each Offeror shall submit one (1) electronic proposal for all Volumes I – V including attachments. ~~plus separately, one (1) paper-version of Volume III, Cost/Price.~~ If the Offeror wishes to be considered for the additional source selection decision, the Price Volume, ~~paper-version and~~ electronic proposal, must include Attachments 0020 and 0021. All such proposals shall address the Government requirements outlined in the Request for Proposal (RFP). Offerors shall submit the proposals, with a cover letter in accordance with the date and time referenced in block 9 of the SF 33. The Offeror bears responsibility for submitting its offer by the specified date/time.

All offerors must allow their proposals to be valid for at least 365 days. To be considered for the additional selection, an Offeror must record 730 calendar days in block 12 of the SF33 (365 days for Source Selection plus 365 for the period of performance of TO 0001). The Government will consider Attachment 0020 valid until the date of award of the ID/IQ. The non-price volumes and Attachment 0021 will be considered valid 365 days from the date of award of the ID/IQ.

However, only the proposal chosen in the additional source selection decision will be asked to extend its proposal validity date for the additional 365 days.

If it is determined that the contractor selected for award of the ID/IQ contract is not successfully performing, the Government intends to offer a contract to the contractor selected in this additional decision.

The Government will announce the selection of the additional proposal at the time of the ID/IQ award.

Any offeror who does not submit Attachment 0021 will not be considered in the additional source selection decision. If an offeror decides to maintain the same prices submitted on Attachment 0020, the offeror is still required to provide Attachment 0021 reflecting the same prices as in Attachment 0020.

L.1.2 Submission of Proposals. (Follow same process for Final Proposal Revision (FPR)) Electronic submissions of proposal files will take place via the AMRDEC Safe Access File Exchange (SAFE). Access to SAFE is available through the website at: <https://safe.amrdec.army.mil/safe/Welcome.aspx>

SAFE supports file sizes up to 2 gigabytes for uploading.

Upload all proposal files using the following naming convention:

VendorName_Vol_#_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058 – See Paragraph 3.1.1.

Once at the AMRDEC site, manually enter the email address eric.t.eischen.civ@mail.mil to submit proposal files to Contracting Specialist, Eric Eischen.

~~Paper submission of proposal Volume III Cost/Price, and only Volume III, shall be mailed to:~~ **No Paper submission for FPR**

~~Army Contracting Command—Rock Island (ACC-RI)
Information Technology Division
Attn: Mr. Jonathan J. Anderson, Contracting Officer
Rock Island Arsenal
3055 Rodman Avenue
Rock Island, IL 61299-8000~~

~~Paper submission of Volume III, Cost/Price, must be sent via registered post or carrier and must be accepted in writing at Rock Island Arsenal prior to the established deadline.~~

L.1.2.1 Period for Acceptance of Offers. The Offeror agrees to hold firm the prices in its offer for 365 calendar days from the date specified for receipt of offers. The Offeror shall make a clear statement in SF 33, Section A on page one (1), block 12 of the RFP that the proposal is valid for 365 calendar days. Offerors who wish to be considered for the additional selection must:

- a. Record 730 calendar days in block 12 of the SF33 (365 days for Source Selection plus 365 for the period of performance of TO 0001).
The Government will consider Attachment 0020 valid until the date of award of the ID/IQ.
- b. Submit Attachment 0021 with pricing for a period of performance beginning twelve months after the TO 0001 Period of Performance has begun.

The non-price volumes and Attachment 0021 will be considered valid 365 days from the date of award of the ID/IQ. This documentation shall be submitted in Volume V.

L.1.2.2 Late Submission. Late proposal submissions will be handled IAW 52.215-1(c)(3).

L.1.2.3 Official Transmissions

L.1.2.3.1 Amendments will be issued via FedBizOpps.

L.1.2.3.2 Point of Contact. Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) and Contract Specialist (CS) are the SOLE points of contact for this procurement. Submit, in writing, any questions or concerns you may have to the PCO and CS. All requests for clarification must be sent, in writing, to both:

PCO

Jonathan J. Anderson

jonathan.j.anderson16.civ@mail.mil

AND

CS

Eric Eischen

eric.t.eischen.civ@mail.mil

L.1.2.3.3 Questions/Comments. ~~Any questions and/or comments submitted regarding this solicitation shall be submitted in writing and shall refer to specific text of the solicitation in the following format:~~ **Discussions are Closed.**

E-mail Subject: ~~Solicitation No. W52P1J-16-R-0058.~~

MS Excel (compatible with MS Excel 2013) file attachment naming convention:

~~VendorName_Q_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xls.~~

~~Format the file with all Questions/Comments and Rationale with Vendor Name and these column headings at the top of each page:~~

Vendor Company Name:						
Vendor POC Name, E-mail, Phone #						
RFP Section	Vol #	Attch #	Page #	Para #	Question/Comment	Rationale

L.1.2.3.4 Questions/Comments and Answers. ~~The PCO and CS will field written questions to ensure that all Offeror inquiries have been addressed in advance of the proposal suspense date/time. It is preferred that only one set of questions be submitted by each Offeror instead of submitting multiple sets of questions. All questions concerning the RFP should be submitted to the PCO and CS no later than 4:00 P.M. Central Time, 14 calendar days from the initial release of the RFP (posting date to FBO).~~

L.1.2.4 During the conduct of this acquisition, the Acquisition Source Selection Interactive Support Tool (ASSIST) will be used by the Government to support the proposal evaluation and source selection process. A separate tool, the ASSIST2Industry, will be used in conjunction with ASSIST to accomplish all exchanges

with Offerors after receipt of proposals. ASSIST2Industry provides the ability for the Government to issue, and the Offerors to receive and respond to, all Evaluation Notices (ENs) in a secure online environment.

In order to initiate the use of ASSIST2Industry, the Government requires the names, company titles, telephone numbers, and email addresses of two (2) individuals that the Offeror has designated as responsible for receiving and responding to Government ENs through ASSIST2Industry. The designation of two (2) individuals is for the purpose of insuring availability of one individual if the other individual is not available. The required information regarding these two (2) individuals must be submitted with the Offeror's proposal and included in the cover letter for Volume V.

After the solicitation closing date, the Government will establish an account in ASSIST2Industry for each individual identified by the Offeror that has submitted a proposal in response to this solicitation. The two individuals named by the Offeror will be authorized access to that account. Two (2) separate system generated emails will be sent to each individual. One of the emails will contain the individual's ASSIST2Industry username. The other email will contain the individual's temporary password. Using the provided username and temporary password, each individual can then go to <https://ASSIST2Industry.army.mil> to access the account. NOTE: The first time a user logs in, the user will be required to change the temporary password before the user can proceed to use the site.

All Offerors are advised that ASSIST2Industry has been updated and it is now the responsibility of PRIME Contractors to establish accounts for their SUBCONTRACTORS to respond to Government ENs. A separate area within ASSIST2Industry has been created to allow authorized Subcontractor POCs to upload proposal EN response files only. Subcontractors will not be able to access any other information on the ASSIST2Industry website (e.g., Questions/Evaluation Notices, Responses, etc.). Once a Subcontractor has been added, they will receive a user ID (e.g., subcontractor0001) and password (an initial password) that will be sent via two separate system generated e-mails. A Subcontractor will have one user ID for all PRIMES and solicitation responses (i.e., if you are a Subcontractor to multiple Prime Contractors and multiple solicitation responses, you will only have one user ID). Once an account has been established for the Subcontractor, go to <https://ASSIST2Industry.army.mil> to access the account. Prime Contractors will only be able to see the number of files submitted by their Subcontractors; but, will be UNABLE TO VIEW the Subcontractor's files.

NOTE: Both Prime Contractors and Subcontractors are instructed to review the ASSIST2Industry User's Guide, located under the "Getting Started" tab on the website. The guide has been updated and provides step by step instructions on how to perform functions and navigate the website.

Offerors can contact the ASSIST2Industry Helpdesk at usarmy.jbmdl.acc.list.vce-helpdesk@mail.mil; (609) 562-5988; or (609) 562-7050 for any technical assistance that may be needed (Monday – Friday; 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM EST).

OFFERORS ARE CAUTIONED THAT THE SYSTEM GENERATED EMAILS REFERRED TO ABOVE ARE INTENDED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY. RECEIPT OF THESE EMAILS DOES NOT CONSTITUTE THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY TYPE OF EXCHANGE WITH THE OFFEROR IN ACCORDANCE WITH FAR 15.306(A), (B), OR (D) (I.E., CLARIFICATIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, OR DISCUSSIONS). ALSO, RECEIPT OF THESE EMAILS DOES NOT SIGNIFY THAT A COMPETITIVE RANGE DETERMINATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH FAR 15.306(C) HAS BEEN MADE OR THAT THE OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE COMPETITIVE RANGE WHEN THAT DETERMINATION IS MADE.

L.1.2.5 Notification of use of non-Government advisors

Offerors are advised that some contractors may participate as non-Government advisors in the evaluation of proposals.

Offerors must submit any required documentation IAW RFP Section H narrative paragraph 3 through 10.

L.2 PROPOSAL STRUCTURE INSTRUCTIONS

L.2.1 This section of the information to Offerors provides general guidance for preparing proposals as well as specific instructions on the format and content of the proposal. To be considered for award, the Offeror's proposal must include all data and information requested by the RFP and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated.

L.2.2 The Government reserves the right to reject any proposal that does not comply with proposal preparation instructions.

L.2.3 The proposal shall be clear, concise and include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government requirements, but shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their facilities and experience and will, with the exception of past performance, base its evaluation on the information presented in the Offeror's proposal.

L.3 PROPOSAL FORMAT

L.3.1 Proposal Organization **See new section L.3.1.1 below**

The Offeror shall prepare the proposal as set forth below.

Gate Criteria:	
Attachment 0027 ACWS Offeror Self Certification	Return with Filenames: VendorName_Attch_0027_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Format as provided. Comment field limited to 500 characters (spaces included), No page limit.
Attachment 0028 ACWS Offeror Software Solution	Return with Filenames: VendorName_Attch_0028_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Format as provided. Comment field limited to 500 characters (spaces included), 15 page limit.
Volume I, Technical/Risk:	Filename: VendorName_Vol_1_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Page limit by section.
Overall Page Limit for Entire Technical/Risk Volume	Overall 50 pages, divided as noted by Factor 1, Subfactor 1 & 2
Cover, Table of Contents and Glossary/Acronym List	No page limit. Not included in 50 page count.
Factor 1 Technical/Risk Introductory Overview and Subfactor 1 Technical Capabilities:	Limit of 35 pages.
Subfactor 2 Management Capabilities:	Limit of 15 pages.
Performance Work Statements:	Overall 200 Pages.
1) ID/IQ PWS:	Included in 200 pages, allocation at Offeror's discretion. Filename: VendorName_PWS_IDIQ_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf
2) TO 0001 PWS:	Included in 200 pages, allocation at Offeror's discretion. Filename:

	VendorName_PWS_TO-0001_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf
Volume I, Attachments:	
1) Integrated Master Schedule	Filename: VendorName_IMS_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.mpp (A minimum of Level 3 tasks with a 1 April 2017 Period of Performance start date) Compatible with MS Project 2013, No page limit.
2) Systems Evolution Description, System View (SV)-8	Filename: VendorName_SV-8_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf View graphical chart not included in Vol I page count. Limit of 2 pages (1 sheet 11"x17"). Consistent with the DoD Architecture Framework (DoDAF)
3) Attachment 0015 Staff Levels and Skill Matrix Schedule	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0015_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Format as Provided. No page limit.
Volume II, Past Performance:	Filename: VendorName_Vol_II_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Page limit by section.
Cover and Front Matter to include Offeror's Company Name, CAGE Code, and DUNs, Table of Contents, Glossary/Acronym List, and all other pertinent administrative data	Not included in page limit.
Summary of the Offeror's role and (if any) include a table listing of Subcontractor(s) as prescribed in L.4.3.1.	Limit 2 pages.
Letters of Consent:	Limit: 1 page for each subcontractor, teaming partner, and/or joint venture (JV) partner.
Contract Reference Description(s):	Relevancy of each reference to the ACWS RFP limited to 500 words or less.
Adverse Contract Performance:	No page limitation.
Attachment 18 Past Performance Questionnaire(s):	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0018_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf

	Format as provided. No page limit. Copies of the completed Sections IIA and IIB only.
Volume III, Cost/Price:	Filename(s): VendorName_Vol_III_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx No page limit.
Cover, Table of Contents and Glossary/Acronym List:	No page limit. NOTE: Cost/Price must be submitted as electronically AND in hard copy.
ACWS Attachment 0020 and 0021 Pricing Matrix:	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0020_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx with supporting Excel files including working formulas. VendorName_Attch_0021_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx with supporting Excel files including working formulas Format as provided. No limit to supporting Excel files.
Volume IV, Small Business Participation:	Filename(s): VendorName_Vol_IV_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Page limit by section.
Cover, Table of Contents and Glossary/Acronym List:	Not included in page limit.
Small Business Participation Proposal:	10 page limit
Attachment 0017 Small Business Participation Matrix:	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0017_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Format as provided. No page limit
Small Business Certifications: (L.4.5.3.2)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_IV_SB_Cert_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Not included in page limit.
Listing of Invoices: (L.4.5.4.1.a.)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_IV_SB_Invoices_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xLsx Maximum of 10 Pages. Vendor Format. Not included in page limit.
Copies of Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISR)s: (L.4.5.4.1.b.)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_IV_SB_ISR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf

	Maximum of three (3) ISRs. Vendor Format. Not included in page limit.
Volume V, Contract Documentation:	Filename(s): VendorName_Vol_V_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf No Page limit.
Cover, Table of Contents and Glossary/Acronym List:	Not included in page limit.
Attachment 0024 - Software License Disclosure and ACWS Master Software License Template:	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0024_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx. VendorName_Attch_0024_W52P1J-16-R-0058.docx. Format as provided. No page limit
Company information specific to the resultant contract:	No page limit.
RFP Compliance Cross Reference Matrix:	Return with Filename: VendorName_Compliance_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Vendor format, No page limit. Not evaluated.
ACWS Attachment 0013 DISA_SRF:	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0013_W52P1J-16-R-0058.docx Format as provided. No page limit. Not evaluated.
ACWS Attachment 0025 Cost and Software Data Reporting Plan:	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0025_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf. Format as provided. No page limit.
Teaming Agreements/Partnership Agreements (L.4.5.4.1.c. and L.4.6.6)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_IV_SB_TAs_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf No page limit.
Small Business Subcontracting Plan (L.4.5.4.1.d. and L.4.6.13)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_V_SB_Pan_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf No page limit.

L.3.1.1 FINAL PROPOSAL REVISION FORMAT (Final Proposal Revision – New Section, only limited highlighting for readability)

The Offeror shall prepare the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) as set forth below. **All proposal files shall be re-submitted**, with exception of the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs). For Volume III, Price/Cost, submit only the electronic copy, do not submit hard copies as instructed previously.

For changes, **highlight all added text in YELLOW or GREEN as noted below**. All content in all files (not just the changes) will be reviewed.

TCPZZ-0123

TCPZZ-0124 to 0155

Admin

Deleted

For the Technical/Risk Volume 1 and the Performance Work Statements (ID/IQ and TO 0001), highlight new text **YELLOW**. For changed or new figures only highlight titles **YELLOW**. Mark responses to specific Evaluation Notices (ENs) with a text box that includes the EN letter-number identifier(s) placed in the margin area in-line with the beginning of the response. See examples on left. Multiple ENs that are grouped together in the same section or paragraph should be grouped in the same text box similar to second example. For administrative edits or deletions mark with a text box with “Admin” or “Deleted” as shown in the examples. **Deleted text shall not be shown**. Use Arial font size no smaller than 8 for these text boxes. **Other similar EN and edit marking methods are acceptable as long as the ENs and edits are clearly marked**.

For Attachment 0024 MS Word file (ACWS Master Software License Template), mark the EN responses with the text box examples on left. Highlight **GREEN** all **new** revisions in tracked changes (strike though or additions). Use text boxes described above to mark ENs.

For .xlsx spreadsheet attachments, shade cells with **new/replaced information YELLOW** and shade cells with deletions **without replaced information GRAY**.

For the IMS, and the New file submission, the Technical/Risk, Technology Demonstration Evaluation Notice Responses and Summary, see the instructions within Section L.3.1.1 table below.

The FPR shall include the latest version of the Government Attachment files per the Amendments (e.g. Attachment 0015 issued in Amendment 0011, dated 2017_01_23).

The Proposal Filename format is the same as the original submission with the letters **“FPR”** inserted before the solicitation number.

The page count is increased for: Volume I, Technical/Risk from an overall limit of 50 pages to an overall limit of 100 pages; and Performance Work Statements from an overall limit of 200 pages to an overall limit of 300 pages. In addition, for Volume I and Volume V, two (2) new files are required to provide the Technical Demonstration EN responses and an EN Cross Reference Matrix. See details in the revised Section **L.3.1.1** table below:

Attachment 0027 ACWS Offeror Self Certification (Submit file version as posted in Amendment 0003 and dated 2016_05_06)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0027_FPR_W52P1J-16-R- 0058.xlsx Format as provided. Comment field limited to 500 characters (spaces included), No page limit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shade cells with new/replaced information YELLOW Shade cells with deletions without replaced information GRAY
Attachment 0028 ACWS Offeror Software Solution (Submit file version as posted in Amendment 0003 and dated 2016_05_06)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0028_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Format as provided. Comment field limited to 500 characters (spaces included), 15 page limit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shade cells with new/replaced information YELLOW. Shade cells with deletions without new/replaced information GRAY
Volume I, Technical/Risk:	Filename: VendorName_Vol_1_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Page limit by section.
Overall Page Limit for Entire Technical/Risk Volume	Overall 100 pages, divided as noted by Factor 1, Subfactor 1 & 2
Cover, Table of Contents and Glossary/Acronym List	No page limit. Not included in 100 page count.
Factor 1 Technical/Risk Introductory Overview and Subfactor 1 Technical Capabilities:	Limit of 70 pages.
Subfactor 2 Management Capabilities:	Limit of 30 pages.
Performance Work Statements:	Overall 300 Pages.

1) ID/IQ PWS:	Included in 300 pages, allocation at Offeror's discretion. Filename: VendorName_PWS_IDIQ_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf
2) TO 0001 PWS:	Included in 300 pages, allocation at Offeror's discretion. Filename: VendorName_PWS_TO_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf
Volume I, Attachments:	
1) Integrated Master Schedule Provide a 1 page summary of changes or a statement "No IMS changes". Format summary per L.3.3 Page Size and Format	Filename: VendorName_IMS_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.mpp VendorName_IMS_Sum_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf (A minimum of Level 3 tasks with a 1 April 2017 Period of Performance start date) Compatible with MS Project 2013, No page limit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight new Text, Tasks, and Milestones YELLOW. • Highlight new tasks not previously included in the IMS or additional detail not originally proposed. • Do not highlight IMS tasks moved to a new parent task as part of any change if these tasks existed in the original IMS. • New milestones or changes to existing milestone dates will be highlighted in yellow. • Highlight deleted tasks (keep task titles) in gray and remove the start and end dates. • There is NO requirement to include or mark deleted tasks or events. Including deleted tasks is acceptable (not required). • As applicable, use the "Note" function on the task list to provide information.

<p>2) Systems Evolution Description, System View (SV)-8 Provide a 1 page summary of changes or a statement "No SV-8 changes". For FPR, provide a CLEAN Graphical Chart – No YELLOW highlights, no callouts.</p>	<p>Filename: VendorName_SV-8_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf View graphical chart and 1 page summary not included in Vol I page count. Limit of 3 pages (1 sheet 11"x17", and 1 summary page 8 ½" x 11"). Consistent with the DoD Architecture Framework (DoDAF)</p>
<p>3) Attachment 0015 Staff Levels and Skill Matrix Schedule (Submit file version as posted in Amendment 0008 with updated instructions and now updated with cells unlocked in Amendment 0011, dated 2017_01_23)</p>	<p>Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0015_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Format as Provided. No page limit.</p>

4) Technical/Risk, Technology Demonstration Evaluation Notice Responses and Summary **(New file submission) For all EN Finding Numbers with ASSIST Subject "Technology Demonstration"**

Filename:

VendorName_Demo_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf

Page limits as follows:

- Limit of **2 pages** for a summary introduction to the content of this file.
- Limit of **1 page with the Offeror's proposed response and 4 pages screenshot/diagrams for each Evaluation Notice Response** (e.g. 5 pages max for 1 EN). Include the EN number(s) at the top of the first page. Concise responses are preferred. Multiple ENs and EN Responses per page are acceptable. Also, multiple EN Responses on one diagram/screenshot are acceptable. The EN Response may include screen shots, call-outs, description boxes, diagrams, tables, figures, and similar graphics as long as it is within the 5 page per EN response limit.
- EN Responses should provide the information as necessary, to address the EN questions and concerns. The EN response should validate the Offeror's proposed technical capabilities as documented in the written proposal and presented in the original Technology Demonstration and during discussions.
- EN Responses may elaborate on information provided in the written proposal only as necessary to respond to the questions in the EN.
- EN Response references to other areas of the proposal are acceptable (e.g., IMS, SOO, etc.) provided that it clearly directs the reader to a specific section, page, row, figure, etc.

Volume II, Past Performance:	<p>Filename: VendorName_Vol_II_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf</p> <p>Page limit by section.</p>
Cover and Front Matter to include Offeror's Company Name, CAGE Code, and DUNs, Table of Contents, Glossary/Acronym List, and all other pertinent administrative data	Not included in page limit.
Summary of the Offeror's role and (if any) include a table listing of Subcontractor(s) as prescribed in L.4.3.1.	Limit 2 pages.
Letters of Consent:	Limit: 1 page for each subcontractor, teaming partner, and/or joint venture (JV) partner.
Contract Reference Description(s):	Relevancy of each reference to the ACWS RFP limited to 500 words or less.
Adverse Contract Performance:	No page limitation.
<p>Attachment 18 Past Performance Questionnaire(s):</p> <p>No Final Proposal Revision (FPR) submission.</p>	<p>Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0018_RFP_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf</p> <p>Format as provided. No page limit.</p>
	Copies of the completed Sections IIA and IIB only.
<p>Volume III, Cost/Price:</p> <p>(As needed, submit Basis of Estimate files as .pdf files in Vendor format)</p>	<p>Filename(s): VendorName_Vol_III_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx VendorName_Vol_III_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf</p> <p>No page limit.</p>

Cover, Table of Contents and Glossary/Acronym List:	No page limit. Submit electronic copy only. NOTE: Cost/Price must be submitted electronically AND in hard copy.
ACWS Attachment 0020 and 0021 Pricing Matrix: (Submit file versions as posted in Amendment 0009 and dated 2016_11_18)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0020_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx with supporting Excel files including working formulas. VendorName_Attch_0021_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx with supporting Excel files including working formulas
Volume IV, Small Business Participation:	Filename(s): VendorName_Vol_IV_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Page limit by section.
Cover, Table of Contents and Glossary/Acronym List:	Not included in page limit.
Small Business Participation Proposal:	10 page limit
Attachment 0017 Small Business Participation Matrix: (Submit file version as posted in Amendment 0003 and dated 2016_05_06)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0017_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Format as provided. No page limit
Small Business Certifications: (L.4.5.3.2)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_IV_SB_Cert_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Not included in page limit.
Listing of Invoices: (L.4.5.4.1.a.)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_IV_SB_Invoices_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Maximum of 10 Pages. Vendor Format. Not included in page limit.

Copies of Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISR)s: (L.4.5.4.1.b.)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_IV_SB_ISR_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Maximum of three (3) ISR's. Vendor Format. Not included in page limit.
Volume V, Contract Documentation:	Filename(s): VendorName_Vol_V_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf No Page limit.
Cover, Table of Contents and Glossary/Acronym List:	Not included in page limit.
Attachment 0024 - Software License Disclosure and ACWS Master Software License Template: (Submit file version as posted in Amendment 0003 and dated 2016_05_06) (As needed, submit approved License Agreements as .pdf files in Vendor format)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0024_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx VendorName_Attch_0024_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.docx VendorName_Attch_0024_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf Format as provided. No page limit
Company information specific to the resultant contract:	No page limit.
RFP Compliance Cross Reference Matrix:	Return with Filename: VendorName_Compliance_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Vendor format, No page limit. Not evaluated.
ACWS Attachment 0013 DISA_SRF: (Submit file version as posted in Amendment 0006 and dated 2016_05_20)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0013_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.docx Format as provided. No page limit. Not evaluated.

ACWS Attachment 0025 Cost and Software Data Reporting Plan: (Submit file version as posted in Amendment 0003 and dated 2016_05_06)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0025_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf. Format as provided. No page limit.
Teaming Agreements/Partnership Agreements (L.4.5.4.1.c. and L.4.6.6)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_IV_SB_TAs_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf No page limit.
Small Business Subcontracting Plan (L.4.5.4.1.d. and L.4.6.13)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Vol_V_SB_Pan_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.pdf No page limit.
ACWS Attachment 0032 RFP Evaluation Notice Cross Reference Matrix (New file submission): (Submit file version as posted in FPR Letter and Amendment 0010, dated 2017_01_11)	Return with Filename: VendorName_Attch_0032_EN_XRef_FPR_W52P1J-16-R-0058.xlsx Format as provided, follow embedded instructions. No page limit. Not evaluated.

L.3.2 Page Limitations

Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read and will not be considered in the evaluation of the proposal. Page limitations may also be established for responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs). The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters forwarding the ENs to the Offerors.

L.3.3 Page Size and Format

L.3.3.1 Page

A page is defined as each face of an 8.5 x 11 inches sheet of paper containing information.

Each volume shall be clearly identified and the text shall begin at the top of each page. All pages of each volume shall be appropriately numbered and identified by the complete company name, date, and RFP number in the header and/or footer. A Table of Contents shall be created using the Table of Contents feature in Microsoft Word. The cover page and table of contents are excluded from the page limitations.

Microsoft Word (.doc or .docx file extensions) files shall use the following page set-up parameters:

Margins (Top, Bottom, Left, Right) = 1.0 inch
Gutter = 0 inches
From Edge Header, Footer = 0.5 inches
Page Size, Width = 8.5 inches
Page Size, Height = 11 inches
Paragraphs = Separated by at least one blank line

Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx file extensions) files shall use the following page set-up parameters:

Margins (Top, Bottom, Left, Right) = 1.0 inch
Gutter = 0 inches
From Edge Header, Footer = 0.5 inches
Page Size, Width (Maximum) = 11 inches
Page Size, Height (Maximum) = 14 inches

When both sides of a sheet display printed material, it shall be counted as two pages. Pages shall be single spaced. Except for the reproduced sections of the RFP document, the font type shall be Arial and text size shall be no less than 12 point. Tracking, kerning and leading values shall not be changed from the default values of the word processing or page layout software. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. These page format restrictions shall apply to responses to ENs. For electronic submissions, page limitations shall be calculated as though the document were printed as a hard copy proposal.

L.3.3.2 Tables, Charts, Graphs, and Figures. These displays shall be uncomplicated, legible, and shall not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size. Foldout pages shall fold entirely within the volume, and count as two (2) pages. Foldout pages may only be used for large tables, charts, graphs, diagrams and schematics; not for pages of text. For tables, charts, graphs and figures, the text shall be no smaller than 10 point font size, **except for FPR EN and edit text boxes or similar marking shall be no smaller than 8 point font size**. For electronic submissions, page limitations shall be calculated as though the document were printed as a hard copy proposal.

L.3.3.3 Each volume shall contain a Glossary/Acronym List of all abbreviations/acronyms used and a definition for each within that volume. Glossaries of abbreviations and acronyms do not count against the page limitations for their respective volumes.

L.3.3.4 Each volume shall be written on a stand-alone basis so that its contents may be evaluated with no cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Information required for proposal evaluation which is not found in its designated volume will be

assumed to have been omitted from the proposal. Within a proposal volume, cross-referencing is permitted where its use would conserve space without impairing clarity.

L.3.3.5 Cost or pricing information of any kind shall NOT be included in any volume except Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal; Volume IV Small Business Participation and Volume V Contract Documentation.

L.3.4 Number of Copies and Format. The Proposal shall be submitted in electronic (searchable) format to the Point of Contact identified in Section L.1.2. Self-extracting .exe files, hyperlinks, and ZIP files are not acceptable. The electronic copies of the proposal shall be submitted in a format readable by Microsoft (MS) Office or searchable Adobe Acrobat (.pdf). Use separate files to permit rapid location of all portions, including factors, exhibits, annexes, and Attachments, if any.

L.4 INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF PROPOSAL CONTENT

Offerors shall submit a full proposal, all volumes and attachments, by the date and time specified.

L.4.1 ~~Gate Criteria~~ Submission of Attachments 0027 and 0028

The Offeror will submit information in Attachments 0027 and 0028 in compliance with stated instructions within each work sheet and the ~~Gate Criteria~~ Below.

Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027) – The Offeror shall follow the instructions within the attachment to provide verification of an ability to meet ALL of the 1,545 requirements in the Requirements Traceability Matrix (Level 5) with one of the methodologies defined in the attachment (i.e., Out of the Box (OOTB), Configuration, Enhancement, Extension, Plug-In/3rd party, Customization, or Not Met) as defined in the Statement of Objectives (SOO) Terms of Reference.

Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028) – The Offeror shall follow the instructions within the attachment to list ALL of the proposed software application(s), or product(s), for the ACWS Solution to include the Commercial Off The Shelf Contract Writing Solution (COTS-CWS) whose core competency (OOTB) is to generate and issue Federal Acquisition Regulation-based (FAR-based) contracting actions (awards, orders, or modifications).

L.4.2 Volume I: Factor 1 – Technical/Risk

This Volume shall describe the Offeror's proposed technical and management solution and approach for meeting the performance and capability requirements specified in the RFP. Responses will be evaluated as defined in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award. Do not merely reiterate the objectives or reformulate the requirements specified in the RFP. This Volume shall not include price information, classified information, or "For Official Use Only" information.

For all proposal content, the ACWS program terms of reference as defined in the SOO, paragraph 2.2 shall be strictly followed.

Volume I shall contain the following information:

Factor 1 – Technical/Risk introductory overview shall state any assumptions associated with the proposed Technical/Risk Factor.

The Offeror's Technical/Risk proposal, as well as its Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027), Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028), Integrated Master Schedule, System View – 8 (SV-8) and proposed PWSs, must address the Government-provided OV-2_SV-1-Views (Attachment 0008) and the ACWS Interface Development Strategy (Attachment 0010). In addition, it must be consistent with the Terms of Reference provided in the SOO and the Requirements Traceability Matrix (Attachment 0005). The Government will perform a cross-reference to confirm.

L.4.2.1 Subfactor 1 - Technical Capabilities

L.4.2.1.1 Technical Solution

The Offeror shall provide a description of the proposed software and associated enabling technologies as follows:

- a. Describe how the proposed software and associated enabling technologies comply with the functional and technical requirements statements provided as Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027) and Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028) to the RFP.
- b. Describe the rationale of the methodology planned to meet the requirements (i.e., OOTB, Configuration, Enhancement, Extension, Plug-In/3rd party, Customization or Not Met) and the rationale for the sequence associated with those efforts.
- c. Describe the proposed solution's current capability to meet the High Level Objectives and the Business Outcomes to include the threshold and objective measures.
- d. Describe the proposed solution's current capability to meet the Key Performance Parameters (KPP) defined in the SOO (Attachment 0001).

L.4.2.1.2 Technical Approach: The Offeror shall provide a description of the proposed technical approach and associated enabling technologies as follows:

- a. Describe the technical approach to achieving the objectives stated in the SOO. Specifically, describe the technical capability to develop, integrate, and test the COTS-CWS solution to meet the High Level Objectives and the Business Outcomes, including Key Performance Parameters (KPPs) for Operational Availability and Net Ready along with interfaces. Describe the rationale for the proposed technical approach including associated risks and benefits.

- b. Describe the technical approach to achieving the objectives stated in the SOO paragraph 6.3.3 for DoD System and Cyber Security requirements in the design, development, deployment, and operations stages to include supply chain risk protection.
- c. Describe the approach to and rationale for delivering capabilities in the Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027) and Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028).
- d. Describe the approach(es) to, rationale for and the composition of labor mix by CLIN, by Task Order as aligned to the Staff Levels Skill Mix Schedule (Attachment 0015).

L.4.2.1.3 Technical Schedule

The Offeror shall provide its ACWS ID/IQ Solution Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) (Offeror's format must be compatible with MS Project 2013), and Systems Evolution Description, Systems View – 8 (SV-8) to meet the ACWS requirements to include all interfaces IAW paragraph L.4.2.4.3.

The Offeror shall provide a summary description of the approach to the IMS and rationale for the activities as follows:

- a. Describe how the IMS will allow the ACWS program to meet the proposal schedule for Limited Deployment (LD), Initial Operational Capability (IOC), Full Deployment (FD) capability, and Full Deployment Decision (FDD) Program Milestones. The offeror shall include a description of the rationale for the timing of the activities, taking into consideration the RFP requirements and the RFP Notional Schedule, based on proven and mature processes.
- b. Describe the rationale for the timing and sequence of the activities in Task Order 0001 based on the SOO and the RFP requirements.
- c. Describe the elements of the graphical Systems Evolution Description, SV-8 that aligns with the Offeror's proposed IMS Build plan/schedule for the proposed software solution(s) that portrays all of the planned interfaces and is consistent with the DoD Architecture Framework (DoDAF).

L.4.2.1.4 Solution Deployment, Training, Operations and Support: The Offeror shall provide an overview of its proposed methods and technical approach to Solution Deployment, Training, Operations and Support to CONUS and OCONUS locations across the Army (Attachment 0011). The Offer shall submit in Vol V, a completed Attachment 0024 Software License Disclosure. The Solution Deployment, Training, Operations and Support overview shall:

- a. Describe the role of the System Integrator, the Software Provider (if different), the Army Contracting Enterprise Subject Matter Experts (SME) and/or any other entities that are expected to provide Operations and Support for the deployed solution. The summary shall identify tasks that must be performed, the timing of

those tasks, and any specialized training and/or skills required by the personnel performing those tasks.

- b. Describe the Configuration Management techniques or methods used to coordinate with the Army to operate and support the software solution, manage license/user access requirements and perform maintenance/upgrades.
- c. Describe the approach for operations and support of the proposed solution to meet the system Operational Availability objectives (HLO-6).
- d. Describe the Solution Deployment, Training, Help Desk, and Support to meet the RFP requirements to include leveraging the use of the 300 Government SMEs and the Government Knowledge Management Portal.
- e. Describe a Software License Approach to meet the requirements of the Army Contracting Enterprise and the objectives of the SOO and the RFP. The approach should provide the Government the ability to operate the software, maintain the proposed software licenses, configure the software solution, and after the ordering period ends, to competitively procure the ACWS solution.

L.4.2.1.5 Technology Demonstration

The Technology Demonstration, which will include an introductory presentation, will be controlled by the PCO and will include Government support staff as determined by the PCO.

At no point during the demonstration will discussions (IAW FAR 15.306(d)) be held. Further details such as date, location, time and specific agenda for the Demonstration will be determined and disseminated after receipt of proposals.

All information necessary for the Technology Demonstration including required pre-staged reference/master data and general scenarios will be provided to each Offeror fourteen (14) calendar days in advance of its scheduled demonstration. All Offerors will be provided the same data and be allowed the same amount of time to prepare for demonstration.

Presenters/Demonstrators will be limited to five (5) personnel and must include at least one (1) of the Key Personnel / Key Positions proposed who is assigned to provide direct support to the ACWS contract.

All Offerors will be provided the same amount of time over three work days based on the schedule in Attachment 0026 for their demonstration, which shall include an introductory presentation. The format, content, and length of the presentation is at the discretion of the Offeror, but given the fixed time for demonstration, the length of the presentation will directly impact the length of the demonstration.

L.4.2.1.5.1 Technology Demonstration – Evaluation Notice Responses and Summary

~~The Offeror shall provide an introductory presentation to introduce its team and the content to be demonstrated. At least 1 of the “Key Personnel / Key Positions” proposed shall be the presenter during the introductory presentation. During the presentation, ALL present personnel shall be introduced.~~

The demonstration **EN Responses and Summary (Offeror Format)** shall be of a preconfigured, FAR-compliant COTS-CWS product and/or components from either 1) an existing Federal user’s active implementation(s) in the native, web-based architecture, 2) an instance of the software and/or components hosted in a non-Federal government Cloud, or 3) software and/or components hosted locally on equipment brought by the offeror to the demonstration. This demonstration **EN Responses and Summary** shall include **EN Responses that represent** verification of the proposed software solution, OOTB capability, ~~and a response to a Script/Scenario (provided upon arrival to demonstration site).~~ Proposed usability features and built-in training/help functions shall be available at all stages of the demonstration. ~~The Offeror’s responses to the Script/Scenario will include at a minimum the following:~~ **The Offeror’s EN Responses will follow the instructions in paragraph 3.1.1. The FPR does not include a Technology Demonstration. The below steps represent the previous Government’s previous demonstration:**

1. Requirements Development: Ability to receive a requirement in multiple formats (e.g., MS Word, MS Excel and Adobe).
2. Build Solicitation: Basic Contract Writing with the Uniform Contract Format; Provide Training Aides / Help Tools; Select Clauses; Build SMARTFORMS and manage the data (e.g. DD Form 1423, SF30, SF33, SF1449); Assign CLIN Types (e.g., FFP, CPFF); Publish/Post an RFP; Publish/Post an amendment.
3. Source Selection: Capability to receive proposals in Offeror’s proposed solution and provide confirmation to Vendors; Enable user to assemble an Evaluation Package for review, create and execute a workflow and evaluate proposals and record ratings.
4. Award: Produce a Conformed Contract in Offeror’s proposed solution; Post notifications for award and notifications for unsuccessful offerors via Offeror’s proposed solution.
5. Contract Administration: Personalization by End User; Rapid adaptability (new data field in a report); Reorganization (DoDAAC Org & Workload changes); Business Intelligence; Receive accepted invoices (manually or automated).
6. Contract Closeout: Record and process an Administrative closeout.
7. ACWS Solution Training: Demonstrate built in training aids/features within the context of the Script/Scenarios 1 – 6 above.
8. Government Personnel/Usability: Provide Government personnel the opportunity to use the Offeror’s proposed solution without assistance from the Offeror’s Demonstration Team unless specifically requested.

L.4.2.2 Subfactor 2 - Management Capabilities

L.4.2.2.1 Systems Engineering Management and Planning

The Offeror shall provide a summary of its approach for Management of Systems Engineering, Design, Development, Test and Evaluation. This summary shall:

- a. Describe the details of the Offerors processes and methodology for the Management of Systems Engineering, Design, Development, Test, Evaluation, and Support Functions as related to the RFP requirements.
- b. Describe the Offeror's experience and demonstrated ability to perform tasks that support the planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, controlling, and approval of Systems Engineering actions to accomplish overall ACWS program objectives for cost, schedule, and performance as related to the RFP requirements.

L.4.2.2.2 Program Management

The Offeror shall provide a summary of its approach for Program Management. This summary shall describe the Program Management approach to control Cost, Schedule, Personnel, Communications, Risk, Quality, Configuration, Documentation, Audit Readiness, Training, Deployment, Organizational Change as well as Operations and Support. This includes details of the experience with any proposed team members and the proposed ACWS Software solution operating in the Federal Government.

L.4.2.2.3 Personnel Qualifications and Personnel Management

The Offeror shall provide a summary of its approach for Personnel Qualifications and Personnel Management. This summary shall:

- a. Describe the approaches for recruiting, managing, and retaining a qualified and capable workforce that possesses the necessary experience, education, certifications, clearances and skills to support the entire scope described in the SOO are proven, mature, complete and feasible as related to the RFP requirements.
- b. Describe the approach to replace departed personnel with equally qualified personnel that meets the process and timeframes specified in the SOO.
- c. Describe the governance procedures to include roles, responsibilities, accountability and clear lines of communication between the Contractor team and the Government for timely problem identification, mitigation and resolution.
- d. Provide a completed Offeror's ACWS Staff Levels and Skill Mix Schedule (Attachment 0015) that includes an estimate of the personnel hours, by labor category and level, proposed for each task (by CLIN and by Task Order) within the proposed PWS. The input for the labor category descriptions shall be stated as position requirements only, not resume content. Offerors must identify Key

Personnel / Key Positions and the qualifications proposed for those positions. The qualifications for those Offeror-identified positions are what Government expects to be committed to the program, and fulfilled if the individual serving in that position needs to be replaced in accordance with SOO paragraph 6.1 (d).

L.4.2.3 - Performance Work Statement (PWS)

L.4.2.3.1 ID/IQ Performance Work Statement (PWS)

The Offeror shall propose a written PWS for the entire scope of the ACWS requirement based on Attachment 0001, ACWS Statement of Objectives. The Offeror's proposed PWS shall be concise, but detailed enough for the Government to determine the Offerors understanding of the nature of the work and plan for providing the services and products required to achieve the ACWS Full Deployment Decision (FDD).

L.4.2.3.2 Task Order 0001 Performance Work Statement (PWS)

The Offeror shall propose a written PWS for the entire scope of the ACWS TO 0001 requirement based on Attachment 0002, ACWS Task Order 0001 Statement of Objectives. The Offeror's proposed TO 0001 PWS shall be concise, but detailed enough for the Government to determine the Offerors understanding of the nature of the work and plan for providing the services and products required to complete the Risk Reduction Phase.

L.4.2.4 - Offeror Self Certification, IMS, and SV-8

L.4.2.4.1 Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027) and Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028)

The Offeror shall submit a complete Technical Capability Self Certification and Offeror Software Solution IAW the instructions in Attachments 0027 and 0028. To be compliant, the offeror shall complete all tabs IAW the instructions. If the offeror's entry into this matrix conflicts with any portion of the proposal, that portion of the matrix shall take precedence over the proposal narrative.

L.4.2.4.2 ACWS ID/IQ Solution Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) (Offeror format .mpp file)

For Government Planning purposes, the IMS shall reflect a 1 April 2017 Period of Performance start date (ID/IQ and Task Order 0001). The Offeror shall submit an IMS (compatible with MS Project 2013). All other formatting is up to Offeror's discretion. The IMS shall clearly state activities to a minimum Level 3 planned over the entire ID/IQ Ordering Period. The Task Order 0001 IMS activities (which shall be included in the ID/IQ IMS) shall include all activities at all anticipated levels for the period of performance for Task Order 0001 IMS. This IMS shall include projected Government activities, decisions and milestones associated with the proposed solution. In addition,

this IMS shall include work streams, deliverables, and offeror's milestones associated with the proposed solution/approach for the performance of the ACWS contract based on the SOO and the requirements of the RFP.

L.4.2.4.3 ACWS Systems Evolution Description, System View (SV)-8 (Offeror format .pdf file)

The Offeror shall submit a graphical Systems Evolution Description, SV-8 that aligns with the Offeror's proposed IMS Build plan/schedule for the proposed software solution(s) that portrays all of the planned interfaces and is consistent with the DoD Architecture Framework (DoDAF).

L.4.3 Volume II: Factor 2 – Past Performance

Each Offeror shall submit a past performance Volume II with its proposal containing past performance information in accordance with the format prescribed below.

L.4.3.1 Format: The Past Performance volume shall be organized according to the following format:

L.4.3.1.1 Cover Page: Offeror's Company Name, CAGE Code, and DUNs

L.4.3.1.2 Table - The Offeror shall provide a table listing each proposed subcontractor's Company Name to include its applicable CAGE Code and DUNs it intends to use in the performance of the ACWS RFP based on L.4.3.1.2.1. Proposed Subcontractor Criteria below.

L.4.3.1.2.1 Proposed Subcontractor Criteria – subcontractors or teaming partners that are proposed to perform at least twenty percent (20%) or more of the work effort based on the total proposed contract value, or any subcontractor or teaming partner the Offeror considers critical to overall successful performance of the ACWS Request for Proposal (RFP).

L.4.3.1.2.2 Joint Ventures – each member of a joint venture (JV) must submit its own past performance information.

L.4.3.1.3 Letters of Consent: Copies of signed and dated Letters of Consent from an authorized agent for each subcontractor, teaming partner or JV that authorizes the Government to discuss the subcontractor's, teaming partner's or each member of the JV's past performance evaluation results with the Offeror during negotiations.

L.4.3.1.4 Contract References: The Offeror may submit no more than three (3) recent and relevant contract and/or project references for itself. In addition to the Offeror's references, no more than two (2) recent and relevant contracts and/or project references may be submitted for each proposed subcontractor, teaming partner or JV

partner. Offerors are required to explain what aspects of the past performance are relevant to the ACWS RFP in 500 words or less for each submitted reference.

L.4.3.1.4.1 Recent contract performance is defined as prime contracts, task orders, delivery orders, or first tier subcontracts where the services or deliverables were performed, or are still being performed, anytime within three (3) years of the issuance of this ACWS RFP. The Government also reserves the right to consider any past performance after the ACWS RFP closing date and prior to award.

L.4.3.1.4.2 Relevant performance means work efforts that are currently or have been performed that are the same or similar in scope, magnitude (dollar value), and complexity of the ACWS RFP. This includes providing COTS based platforms and/or performing systems development and configuration, interface development, testing, delivery, deployment, training, and help desk support activities. Of particular interest is performance of other Federal or DoD contract writing system contracts.

L.4.3.1.5 Adverse Contract Performance

The Offeror shall identify every relevant contract it was awarded that experienced any performance problems related to deliverables or services; and every recent government contract that was terminated for cause or default within the past three (3) years of issuance of the ACWS RFP. The number of contract(s) submitted in response to L.4.3.1.5 is unlimited. For any contract falling under this description provide the following information:

- a. Government Contract Number, place of performance, CAGE Code and DUNS Number. If the work was performed as a 1st tier subcontractor, also provide the name of the prime contractor and point of contact (POC) within the prime contractor organization (name, and current address, email address, and telephone numbers).
- b. Government contracting activity Contracting Officer's name, e-mail address, telephone numbers.
- c. Government technical representative/COR, and current e-mail address, telephone numbers.
- d. Contract number and, in the case of indefinite delivery type contracts, GSA contracts, and Blanket Purchase Agreements, include Task/Delivery Order Numbers as well.
- e. Period of performance of the contract or task/delivery order.
- f. Provide a copy of any cure notices or show cause letters received,
- g. Identify reason for any termination,
- h. State any corrective actions taken,
- i. Describe the extent to which the corrective action has been successful, identifying points of contact who can confirm the success of the corrective measures.

L.4.3.1.5.1 If there are no contracts meeting the descriptions above, the Offeror must so state that in Volume II of its proposal. Failure to include this information may be cause for rejection of an Offeror's proposal as incomplete.

~~L.4.3.1.6 Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)~~ **NOT submitted for FPR**

~~The Offeror shall submit a PPQ (Past Performance Questionnaire Attachment 0018) for each of the past performance references included in the proposal. Offerors are also required to complete Section IIA. General Information and Section IIB. Contract Identification of the PPQ and include the only the completed Sections IIA and IIB in Volume II of the ACWS RFP.~~

~~L.4.3.1.6.1 Offerors supplying such information shall send the questionnaire to the point of contact (POC) requesting the remaining portions of the PPQ to be completed by the POC.~~

~~L.4.3.1.6.2 The Offeror shall request the PPQ Respondent return the completed questionnaire directly to the Government email address cited on the questionnaire on or before the due date of the solicitation closure date. All questionnaires completed by the POC shall be sent from the POCs email address directly to the Government email address; not to the Offeror for forwarding to the Government. The POC Respondent shall submit the completed PPQ to:~~

~~Jonathan J. Anderson
Procuring Contracting Officer
Mail to: jonathan.j.anderson16.civ@mail.mil~~

~~AND~~

Eric Eischen
Contract Specialist
Mail to: eric.t.eischen.civ@mail.mil

~~Past Performance Questionnaires submitted for an Offerors significant teaming partners and/or subcontractors shall clearly indicate the name of the Prime Offeror on the questionnaire.~~

~~Submission of Past Performance Questionnaires should be made no later than the proposal due date specified in the RFP.~~

L.4.4 Volume III: Factor 3 – Cost/Price

*****NOTE*****

Only one Price Matrix submission (Attachment 0020) is necessary to be considered for the ID/IQ award. However, if the Offeror wants to be considered in the additional source selection decision, it must fill out two price matrices (Attachments 0020 and 0021).

No contract award will be made to the additional offeror selected at the time of the ID/IQ award. The Government intends to offer that offeror with a contract should the ID/IQ awardee fail to successfully perform.

ACWS Price Matrix (Attachment 0020) will cover the initial 12-month base ordering period, the 48-month option ordering period 1, and the 60-month option ordering period 2.

ACWS Additional Price Matrix (Attachment 0021) will contain the same base and option ordering period structure as the ID/IQ; however, the Offerors shall price Attachment 0021 to begin 12 months after the ID/IQ Period of Performance has begun.

Any Offeror who does not submit Attachment 0021 will not be considered in the additional source selection decision. If an Offeror decides to maintain the same prices submitted on Attachment 0020, the Offeror is still required to provide Attachment 0021 reflecting the same prices as in Attachment 0020.

Cost Realism will be performed on the cost CLINs in both Attachment 0020 and Attachment 0021.

All Offerors shall use the same annual escalation rate of 2% (two percent) for all Cost CLINs for all ordering periods. This is to normalize the escalation rates for evaluation purposes only.

The Government will not accept a second technical, past performance or small business volume. The initial submission for these three factors will be considered along with Attachment 0021 for the selection of the additional proposal.

L.4.4.1 Cost/Price introductory overview shall state any assumptions associated with the proposed Cost/Price Factor.

L.4.4.2 The Offeror shall complete the ACWS Price Matrix (Attachment 0020). Each area that requires the Offeror's input has been highlighted in Blue. Please note the price for each Build will be entered on the Tab "Individual Builds" and will automatically be brought forward to the Price Evaluation Summary. The "Individual Builds" Tab allows for up to six (6) Builds. However, if additional Builds are required adjust the Individual Builds Tab as needed. Also, note the price for Support will be entered on the

Tab Support and will automatically be brought forward to the Price Evaluation Summary. The Support Tab allows for ten (10) years of Support, if necessary. In response to the solicitation, the Offeror shall provide a detailed cost proposal for each of the cost CLINs (0003, 0004, and 0006) with the exception of CLINs 0012 and 0013 which will have surrogate (Government provided number) amounts. Each proposed Build identified on tab "Individual Builds" in Attachment 0020, Price Matrix, under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 requires a separate cost proposal. Each proposed Support identified on Tab Support under CLINs 0003, 0004, and 0006 requires a separate cost proposal. To be considered for the additional selection, the Offeror must also complete Attachment 0021 following these same instructions.

The anticipated CLIN structure for the base award and/or task orders is as follows:

- CLIN 0001 (FFP) - Program Management
- CLIN 0002 (FFP) - Systems Engineering Management and Planning
- CLIN 0003 (CPFF) - Solution Design and Development
- CLIN 0004 (CPFF) - Test and Evaluation
- CLIN 0005 (FFP) - Training
- CLIN 0006 (CPFF) - Solution Deployment
- CLIN 0007 (FFP) - Organizational Change Management
- CLIN 0008 (FFP) - Operations and Support
- CLIN 0009 (FFP) - Licenses (for Commercial Software)
- CLIN 0010 (FFP) – Transition Out
- CLIN 0011 (FFP) - Studies, Analysis, Assessments and Improvements
- CLIN 0012 (Cost Reimbursable) - Travel (Non-Fee Bearing)
- CLIN 0013 (Cost Reimbursable) - Other Direct Cost (ODC) (Non-Fee Bearing)
- CLIN 0014 (Not Separately Priced) - Contractor Manpower Reporting
- CLIN 0015 (Not Separately Priced) - Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL)

L.4.4.3 The detailed cost proposal shall include ALL proposed costs to include the Prime, Subcontractors, and any other cost the Offeror would utilize to accomplish the CLIN broken out by phase and/or build. This information shall be submitted electronically in Excel format with working formulas ~~and a paper copy~~ - prepared in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.403-5(b). An Offeror may use its own format for the cost proposal as long as it contains all the elements and detail as delineated in FAR Table 15-2, Instructions for Submitting Cost/Price Proposals When Cost or Pricing Data are required.

Supporting documentation shall be included within ~~both the electronic and paper copy~~ of the cost proposal. The supporting documentation is required for the Government to perform the mandatory cost realism analysis. The support documentation shall be labeled, legible, and identifiable. The submitted Cost Proposal MUST contain all information required by FAR Table 15-2. The following are examples of supporting documentation that shall be included with the submission of the cost proposal and is NOT all inclusive.

L.4.4.4 Pricing Narrative

Pricing introductory overview shall state any assumptions associated with the proposed Pricing Factor and application of indirect rates and associated rationale.

L.4.4.5 Direct Labor Rates

The documentation used as the Basis of Estimate, i.e., Payroll data documenting the labor rates, letters of intent, wage surveys, Defense Contract Audit Agency/Defense Contract Management Agency (DCAA/DCMA) audited/reviewed labor rate, etc.

L.4.4.6 Proposed Indirect Rates, Fringes, and Factors

An Offeror having a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP), Forward Pricing Rate Recommendation (FPRR) or Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA) shall include this documentation when submitting the proposal. An Offeror not having this documentation shall provide all of the necessary data to review the indirect rates; the following data is required.

L.4.4.6.1 Indirect Cost Pool

A descriptive summary of the costs proposed in each pool is required to be submitted in the Offeror's proposal. Any Subcontractor submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, shall also provide a descriptive summary of the costs proposed in each pool. An indirect cost pool is a logical grouping of indirect costs with a similar relationship to the cost objectives. For example, maintenance overhead pools include indirect costs that are associated with maintenance effort.

L.4.4.6.2 Indirect Cost Allocation Base

The Offeror shall describe the indirect cost allocation base. Any Subcontractor submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, shall also describe the indirect cost allocation base.

L.4.4.7 Budgetary Data

The Offeror shall provide budgetary rate data to support the proposed indirect rates. Any Subcontractor submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, shall also provide budgetary rate data for the proposed indirect rates. The data provided shall be the costs for the pools and bases used to calculate the proposed indirect cost rates. Appropriately detailed explanations shall be provided for the basis of the proposed indirect rates. If budgetary data from a prior year has been used to estimate the proposed indirect rates, provide that explanation. If any portion of the proposed indirect rates is a discreet estimate, an explanation and supporting data shall be provided. The

budgetary data shall include the pool and base summary information as explained in the previous paragraphs. If the data is not available, the Offeror and/or Subcontractor shall provide an explanation why the data cannot be provided.

L.4.4.8 Historical Cost Data (Historical Rates)

The Offeror shall provide historical cost data for the most recent two years at the time of cost proposal submittal. Any Subcontractor submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, shall also provide historical actual cost data for the most recent two years at the time of cost proposal submittal. The historical data shall be provided in the same format as proposed rates and include detailed actual pool and base costs. If the data is not available, the Offeror/Subcontractor shall provide an explanation why the data cannot be provided.

L.4.4.9 Sales Data

The Offeror shall provide historical sales data for the most recent two years at the time of cost proposal submittal. The Offeror shall also provide budgetary sales data utilized in the calculation of the proposed indirect rates. Any Subcontractor submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, shall also provide budgetary sales data to support the proposed rates.

L.4.4.10 Subcontractors

Submission must include the methodology, supported by documentation, used by the Offeror to determine the Subcontractor's proposal fair and reasonable, as well as the contract type between the Prime and Subcontractor.

L.4.4.11 Failure in the submission of all required supporting documentation for the Offeror and/or its proposed Subcontractors may render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal may not be further evaluated and may not be considered for award.

L.4.4.12 All Prime and Subcontractor proposals for this solicitation shall be stated in U.S. dollars.

L.4.4.13 Submission of ~~both hard copies and~~ electronic copies of the proposal Cost/Price Volume is required.

~~In the event of a discrepancy in pricing between the electronic and paper copies of the proposal, the prices contained in the electronic copy shall prevail.~~

The electronic cost proposals shall be submitted in Microsoft Office compatible formats, i.e., Excel (compatible with MS Office 2013). The electronic version of the cost proposal

shall contain working formulas/algorithms and shall be in the same format as the hard copy of the cost proposal.

The cost proposal response is presumed to represent the Offeror's best effort to respond to the solicitation. Any significant inconsistency between promised performance and cost should be explained in the pricing narrative. For example, if the use of new and innovative techniques has an impact on cost, that impact on cost should be explained by the Offeror. If a management decision has been made to absorb a portion of the program costs that have not been included in the proposal, that decision should be stated and quantified in the pricing narrative. Any significant inconsistency, if not explained, raises a fundamental issue of the Offeror's understanding of the nature and scope of the work required, and may be grounds for rejection of the proposal. The burden of proof as to cost credibility rests with the Offeror.

L.4.5 Volume IV: Factor 4 – Small Business Participation

L.4.5.1 Small Business Participation introductory overview shall state any assumptions associated with the proposed Small Business Participation Factor.

L.4.5.2 Small Business Participation Proposal

L.4.5.2.1 The Offeror shall demonstrate small business participation by detailing its proposed approach to meet the requirements under this factor by addressing the following two areas in its Small Business Participation proposal:

- a. Proposed Small Business Participation
- b. Commitment to Small Business

Definitions:

Participant - as used in this factor, includes the Offeror as well as any Subcontractor.

Participation - as used in this factor, includes the work (dollars) performed by the Offeror, as well as the work (dollars) performed by Subcontractors.

Recent - is defined anytime within three (3) years of the issuance of this ACWS RFP.

Requirement - as used in the adjectival ratings for this factor, is defined as a small business participation plan.

L.4.5.3 Proposed Small Business Participation

L.4.5.3.1 The Offeror's proposal shall include a completed Small Business Participation.

The Offeror shall populate every column on the Attachment 0017 for each participant.

The Small Business Participation shall identify:

- a. Full Company Name for each participant.
- b. CAGE Code each for each participant.

- c. Each Socio-Economic Category the participant qualifies for (Small Business (SB), Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone) Small Business).
- d. Total Dollars allocated to the participant for the total period of performance of five (5) year base ordering period with a five (5) year option ordering period. The Offeror shall include proposed participation dollars for itself in the small business participation field, if a SB, or in other than small business participation field, if other than small.
- e. The total dollars proposed for each category (SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, and Other than Small Businesses).
- f. The total contract value (total dollars proposed to Small Businesses + total dollars proposed to Other than Small Businesses). The total participation dollars shall equal the total evaluated price or Subtotal Contract Value proposed in Attachment 0020 - Price Matrix.
- g. The percentage of participation (goal) for each socio-economic category.

Note: Small Business participation shall include total dollars allocated for the business in each category for which the business qualifies. For example, if the Offeror allocates \$100 to a HUBZone-certified SDVOSB, the Offeror would include \$100 in the SB category, \$100 in the HUBZone category, \$100 in the SDVOSB category, and \$100 in the VOSB category.

L.4.5.3.2 Small Business Certifications. The Offeror shall provide the written certification of size and socio-economic status for each small business subcontractor proposed for this procurement. The Offeror may, but is not required to, provide a copy of the System for Award Management (SAM) certifications for clause 52.219-1, Small Business Program Representations in lieu of written certifications. However, for HUBZone certified subcontractors, the Offeror shall provide evidence of HUBZone certification using one of the methods in FAR clause 52.219- 8(d)(2). The written certifications shall match the size and socio-economic status identified in the Small Business Participation (Attachment 0017) for each subcontractor.

L.4.5.4 Commitment to Small Business

L.4.5.4.1 The Offeror's proposal shall also provide evidence supporting the Offeror's commitment to small business. The Offeror shall provide information on its historical small business participation. This information shall address:

- a. Listing of Invoices: Compliance with all terms and conditions of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns (when required on recent contracts). This shall include procedures established to ensure timely payments to small business subcontractors, and evidence of timely payments to subcontractors. The Offeror shall include a listing of invoices showing the date the invoice was

submitted, payment terms, and the date the invoice was paid. This clause is normally in most Federal contracts, and is also applicable to small businesses. If not required in any recent and relevant contracts, the Offeror shall so state.

- b. Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR). Compliance with terms and conditions of FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting plan (when required on recent contracts), including actual small business utilization compared to small business participation goals identified in the approved subcontracting plan for each recent contract that included a subcontracting plan. Offerors shall identify the date of the last Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR) and submit copies of three (3) reports, including the last report. Offerors shall address achievement on each individual goal stated within the subcontracting plan including an explanation demonstrating good faith effort if the goal was not achieved. If not required in any recent contracts, the Offeror shall so state.
- c. Teaming Agreements/Partnership Agreements. The Offeror may submit additional documentation that demonstrates a commitment to small business. The documentation may include bilateral teaming arrangements, an explanation of internal controls/documentation/systems, or any other documentation that demonstrates a commitment to small business. The Offeror's submission must explain how the documentation demonstrates a commitment to small business. Lack of documentation may be viewed as the Offeror not having a strong commitment to the Government's small business program. The Teaming Agreements/Partnership Agreements shall be submitted in Volume V, per L.3.1.1 and L.4.6.6.
- d. Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Note for Other than Small Businesses ONLY. Separate from Small Business Participation, Other than Small Business Offerors shall also submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan as required by FAR 19.7 (FAR Clause 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan). The Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall be consistent with proposed Small Business Participation. The subcontracting plan shall be submitted in Volume V, per L.3.1.1 and L.4.6.13.

L.4.6 Volume V: Contract Documentation

L.4.6.1 Transmittal Letter and RFP/Contract Form (SF33)

L.4.6.2 Contract Information. Offerors shall complete and submit a complete solicitation (e.g. Standard Form 33 and Sections A-K) to include all "fill-in" data herein.

L.4.6.3 Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan. The Offeror and any subcontractor who furnishes advice, information, direction, or assistance to an offeror or any other contractor in support of the preparation or submission of an offer for a Government contract by that offeror, shall provide an OCI plan that identifies any potential or actual Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest (OCCI) as described in FAR Subpart 9.5. The OCI plan shall provide any and all methods to avoid, neutralize or mitigate present and future conflicts of interest.

L.4.6.4 Authorized Offeror Personnel. Provide the name, title, and telephone number of the company/division point of contact for the proposal and who can obligate the Offeror contractually. Also, identify those individuals authorized to negotiate with the Government.

L.4.6.5 Company /Division Address, Identifying Codes, and Applicable Designations: Provide company/division's street address, county and facility code; CAGE code; DUNS code; Tax Identification Number (TIN); size of business (large or small); and labor surplus area designation. This same information must be provided if the work for this contract will be performed at any other locations. List all locations where work is to be performed and indicate whether such facility is a division, affiliate, or subcontractor, and the percentage of work to be performed at each location.

L.4.6.6 Prime contractors shall include signed Teaming Agreements/Partnership Agreements for ALL named teaming partners. Submit IAW, paragraph L.3.1.1, and L.4.5.4.1.c, in Volume V.

L.4.6.7 Defense Information Systems Agency Service Request Form (DISA SRF) (Attachment 0013). The Offeror shall submit a DISA SRF that follows the instructions within the Attachment 0013 and is Compliant with the requirements of the RFP to provide the Government with Software Hosting requirements.

L.4.6.8 ACWS Software License Disclosure (Attachment 0024)

The Offeror shall submit a contract Software Licensing Disclosure that follows the instructions within the Attachment 0024 and is compliant with the requirements of the RFP and specifically the applicable listed contract clauses (e.g., Section H and I). Offerors shall submit licenses for software disclosed in accordance with the contents of the ACWS Master Software License Agreement included in Attachment 0024.

L.4.6.9 ACWS Cost and Software Data Reporting (CSDR) Plan (Attachment 0025)

The Offeror shall submit a contract CSDR Plan, DD Form 2794, that follows the ACWS Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and is compliant with MIL-STD-881C, to at least Level 2. IAW DFARS 252.234-7003, the Offeror is permitted to provide comments to the Government CSDR Plan and propose changes at the lowest level while maintaining alignment with the Government CSDR Plan. The Offeror shall submit a Contractor WBS (CWBS) IAW SOO paragraph 6.1 b). The Offeror submitted CWBS may vary from the Government WBS while remaining in alignment with the CSDR Plan in order to ensure that the 1921 reports are traceable to such structure. The Offeror's submitted CSDR Plan will be reviewed and finalized with the Government at the post-award conference.

L.4.6.10 If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), a copy of the agreement between parties shall be included in Volume V.

L.4.6.11 The Offeror shall include in its proposal incentives that pertain to cost, schedule, and/or performance in accordance with FAR 16.4, Incentive Contracts. The Government's priority for incentives is to maximize capability at IOC, accelerate LD and FD, and ensure maximum user adoption. The proposed incentives may be included in the negotiated incentives prior to the Task Order (TO) 0001 PoP expiration as delineated in Section B of this solicitation. Proposed incentives will not be evaluated as part of the source selection decision.

L.4.6.12 Compliance and Cross Reference Matrix (Offeror format). The Offeror shall submit a complete Compliance and Cross Reference Matrix that provides the Government with the visibility to the relationships between Section L, Section M, SOO, Deliverables, CLIN, and Offerors Proposal Volume to include page number. If the offeror's entry into this matrix conflicts with any portion of the proposal, that portion of the proposal shall take precedence over this matrix.

L.4.6.12.1 ACWS RFP Evaluation Notice Cross Reference Matrix (Attachment 0032): The Offeror shall submit a complete Evaluation Notice Cross Reference Matrix that provides the Government with the visibility to where the EN Responses are embedded in the Offerors Proposal. (Submit file version as posted in FPR Letter and Amendment 0010, dated 2017_01_11)

L.4.6.13 Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The Offeror shall submit IAW, paragraph L.3.1.1, and L.4.5.4.1.d., in Volume V.

***** END OF SECTION L NARRATIVE *****

SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 GENERAL

M.1.1 Competition

The Government is conducting this Full and Open competition in accordance with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.101 – Best Value Continuum.

Any award to be made will be based on the following two-step approach:

- 1) Acceptable/Unacceptable Gate.
- 2) Offerors who receive a rating of "Acceptable" in the first step will then be evaluated using a best value approach.

M.1.2 Gate Criteria

Upon receipt of proposals, the Government will review the submitted information in Attachments 0027 and 0028 for compliance with the stated Gate Criteria in Section L, paragraph L.4.1, on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. A proposal that receives a rating of "Unacceptable" in one or both of the Gate Criteria will render the entire proposal ineligible for award and will not be further evaluated. For offerors rated "Acceptable" for the Gate Criteria, the Government will evaluate the entire proposal, including Attachments 0027 and 0028, in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in Section M of the solicitation.

The Gate Criteria will be rated on an acceptable/unacceptable basis as follows:

Acceptable = Proposal meets the minimum requirements of the Gate.

Unacceptable = Proposal does not meet the minimum requirements of the Gate.

Gate Criteria:

Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027) –the proposed ACWS solution will have the ability to meet ALL of the requirements in the Requirements Traceability Matrix (System Level 5) with no more than 50% of the System Level Requirements (no more than 772 of 1,545) proposed as Customization (Column Q, Category F).

Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028) –the primary proposed Commercial Off The Shelf Contract Writing Solution (COTS-CWS) software application(s), or product(s), whose core competency (out of the box) is to generate and issue Federal Acquisition Regulation-based (FAR-based) contracting actions (awards, orders, or modifications) demonstrates maturity with a deployment to at least 1,000 Federal Government users whose installed copy is not separated by more than two (2) versions.

M.1.3 Basis for Award:

The ID/IQ award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal is determined to offer the best value to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the four (4)

evaluation Factors: Technical/Risk, Past Performance, Cost/Price, and Small Business Participation. In addition to the selection of the awardee for the ID/IQ contract, the Government will identify an additional contractor using the same criteria set forth for the ID/IQ award. Excluding the ID/IQ awardee, all offerors that submitted Attachment 0021 that passed the Gate Criteria will be considered for the additional selection.

No contract award will be made to the additional offeror selected at the time of the ID/IQ award. The Government intends to offer that offeror with a contract should the ID/IQ awardee fail to successfully perform.

M.2 FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

M.2.1 The following evaluation Factors will be used to evaluate each proposal for the ID/IQ award:

- Factor 1 Technical/Risk
- Factor 2 Past Performance
- Factor 3 Price Matrix (Attachment 0020)
- Factor 4 Small Business Participation

The same evaluation factors will be used for the additional selection, replacing Attachment 0020 with Attachment 0021.

M.2.2 Relative Order of Importance

Factor 1 Technical/Risk is more important than Factor 2 Past Performance.

Factor 2 Past Performance is more important than Factor 3 Cost/Price.

Factor 3 Cost/Price is more important than Factor 4 Small Business Participation.

Evaluation Factors 1, 2 and 4 when combined, are significantly more important than Factor 3 Cost/Price.

Under Factor 1 Technical/Risk, there are two Subfactors:

Subfactor 1 Technical Capabilities, Subfactor 2 Management Capabilities.

Subfactor 1 Technical Capabilities, which includes a Technology Demonstration, is more important than Subfactor 2 Management Capabilities. There are no Subfactors under Past Performance, Cost/Price, or Small Business Participation.

M.2.3 Consideration for Award

To receive consideration for the ID/IQ award, an Adjectival Rating of at least "Acceptable" must be achieved for the Technical/Risk Factor, each Technical/Risk Subfactor and the Small Business Participation Factor. The Adjectival Ratings are defined at the end of the respective Factor sections.

Offerors are cautioned that an award might not be made to the proposal with the highest rated or to the lowest Cost/Price Offeror. Furthermore, if the non-Cost/Price Factors are evaluated as comparatively equal between two or more Offerors, then Cost/Price Factor may become the determining Factor for award.

The additional source selection decision will be made in the same matter.

M.3 EVALUATION APPROACH

M.3.1 Evaluation Scope

All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by the Government Source Selection Team. Proposal content will be evaluated to determine the degree and extent to which the requirements set forth in the RFP are satisfied. Assumptions will not be made by Government evaluators regarding areas not defined in an Offeror's submitted proposal with the exception of the Past Performance Factor where data extrinsic to an Offeror's proposal may be evaluated.

M.3.1.1 Compliance

Each proposal determined "Acceptable" in the first step, Gate Criteria, will be evaluated to determine if it is compliant with and responsive to the terms and conditions of the RFP. These terms include the definitions in SOO Paragraph 2.2. Any deviations or non-compliances discovered in the compliance review may result in the proposal being rejected. Any proposal information submitted that is not in accordance with instructions provided in Section L will not be evaluated.

M.3.2 Factor 1 – Technical/Risk

All assumptions will be reviewed for compliance with the ACWS requirements, feasibility and risk.

The factor includes an assessment of Volume I Technical/Risk and the following attachments: the offeror's proposed ID/IQ Contract Performance Work Statement (PWS) which shall be aligned with Government-provided Statement of Objectives (SOO), a proposed Task Order 0001 PWS shall be aligned with Government-provided Task Order 0001 SOO, the proposed Integrated Master Schedule, the proposed SV-8, and proposed Attachments 0015, 0027 and 0028.

The Technical/Risk Factor is combined. Risk will be assessed as an inherent part of the Technical Factor to form the basis of the Factor rating. See table M.3.2.3 for the definitions of the combined Technical/Risk Ratings.

The Government will assess the offeror's Technical proposal for feasibility and risk in accordance with:

- a. The proposed approach is feasible and the end results are achievable
- b. The proposed performance is contingent upon proven products and techniques to deliver a Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) Contract Writing System (CWS)¹ and management solution
- c. The proposed tasks and technical requirements can be successfully completed within the proposed schedule and defined ACWS constraints.

M.3.2.1 Sub Factor 1 – Technical Capabilities

M.3.2.1.1 Technical Solution

The submission of the Offeror's description of the proposed software and associated enabling technologies will be evaluated as follows:

¹ "DoD defines a COTS CWS as a commercially available software application, or product, whose core competency (out of the box) is to generate and issue FAR-based contracting actions (awards, orders, or modifications)." (DoD Strategic Plan For Defense Wide Procurement Capabilities (A Functional Strategy), Version 2.1, February 2016)

- a. The extent to which the description meets the requirements in the RFP and aligns with the proposed Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027) and Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028).
- b. The extent to which the description includes the rationale for the methodology planned to meet the requirements (e.g., Out of the Box, Configuration, Enhancement, Extension, Plug-In/3rd party, Customization, or Not Met) and the rationale for the sequence associated with those efforts.
- c. The extent to which the proposed software solution description provides proven capability to meet the High Level Objectives and the Business Outcomes to include the threshold and objective measures.
 - i. The proposed COTS-CWS core solution that has an OOTB capability to meet HLO-1 / BO-1 “System will provide baseline capabilities and is adaptable to implement emerging requirements based on policy changes and/or user needs” is preferred.
 - ii. The proposed COTS-CWS core solution that has an OOTB capability to meet the Key Performance Parameters (KPPs) for Operational Availability and Net Ready is preferred.
- d. The submissions of the Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027) will be evaluated as follows for each of the 1,545 requirements (Level 5 System Requirement) selected:
 - i. OOTB is the most preferred method of meeting the requirement.
 - ii. Requirements not met OOTB, must be met through an open and adaptable solution architecture. The ability to adapt the proposed COTS-CWS core solution to meet ACWS requirements must be demonstrated through one or more of the following methods (in order of preference)
 - Configuration,
 - Enhancement
 - Extension,
 - Plug-in / 3rd Party,
 - Customization, (the least preferred method).
 - iii. For TAB: Requirements Worksheet: Comments will be reviewed for the extent to which they provide an explanation for the method selected, with defensible logical comments preferred.
 - iv. For TAB: Interfaces: For the Column asking “Available Out of the Box”, selecting “Yes” is the most preferred. Comments will be reviewed for the extent to which they provide an explanation for the method selected, with defensible logical comments preferred.
- e. The submissions of the Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028) – all software components in the response - will be evaluated as follows for each of the 53 requirements (Level 4 Detailed Capability) selected:

- i. Software with previous USG deployment is preferred more than software without previous USG deployment.
- ii. Software that includes OOTB highly complex interfaces is the most preferred.
- iii. The COTS-CWS core software, and any other software for the solution proposed (listed in Attachment 0028) that is deployed to over 1,000 individual Federal Government Users with a single instance is preferred over any lesser number of users. All software solution components deployed to over 1,000 Federal Government Users are viewed in step increments of 1,000 (e.g. 2,000, 3,000), with higher numbers more preferred.
- iv. Software proposed as a Plug-in/3rd Party with previous Federal Government deployment reflected in Attachment 0028 is more preferred than Plug-in/3rd without previous Federal Government deployment.
- v. For TAB: Proposed Solution: Comments (Column I) will be reviewed for the extent to which they provide an explanation for the Software Proposed, with defensible logical comments preferred.

For this subfactor, the data provided in Attachments 0027 and 0028 will not be evaluated with a simple count method. Rather, for Attachment 0027, (tab titled Requirements Worksheet), the Priority defined in Column K (Low, Med, High), combined with Build Number proposed in Column S, along with the responses on tab titled Interfaces, will significantly impact the rating applied to Subfactor 1 (e.g. a high priority OOTB delivery in Build 1 is the best possible scenario, while high priority customized delivery in the last Build (Build N) is the worst possible scenario). For Attachment 0028, software deployed to multiple sites to a large number (each with more than 1,000) of Federal Government Users under a common configuration control or version control is preferred.

M.3.2.1.2 Technical Approach

The submission of Offerors Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) Contracting Writing System (CWS) solutions, including interfaces and technical approach to design, develop, integrate, test, deploy and support the solution to meet the High Level Objectives and the Business Outcomes will be evaluated as follows:

- a. The extent to which the Offeror's technical approach realizes the objectives stated in the Statement of Objectives (SOO). Specifically, the Government will assess the extent to which the Offeror's technical approach to development, integration, and testing a COTS-CWS, and all required interfaces to meet the High Level Objectives and the Business Outcomes, to include the identified Threshold and Objective measures, is comprehensive and realistic. A technical approach in which the offeror demonstrates implementation of the proposed COTS-CWS core software to more than 1,000 users in Federal space is preferred.

- i. The approach that has a proven capability to meet HLO-1 / BO-1 “System will provide baseline capabilities and is adaptable to implement emerging requirements based on policy changes and/or user needs” is preferred.
 - ii. The approach that has a proven capability to meet the KPPs for Operational Availability and Net Ready is preferred.
- b. The extent to which the approach meets DoD System and Cyber Security requirements in the design, development, deployment, and operation stages to include supply chain risk protection. A Cyber Security approach that has already been demonstrated with the COT-CWS core software with Federal users is preferred.
- c. The extent to which the approach to deliver capabilities in the Offeror Self Certification (Attachment 0027) and Offeror Software Solution (Attachment 0028) are feasible and based on proven and mature products, whereby multiple previous deployments is preferred.
- d. The extent to which the description addresses the proven approach(es), rationales and the composition of labor mix by CLIN, by Task Order (Attachment 0015).

M.3.2.1.3 Technical Schedule

ACWS ID/IQ Solution Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) (Offeror’s format compatible with MS Project 2013, reflecting 1 April 2017 Period of Performance start date). The submission of the Offeror’s activities for analysis, design, development, test, deploy and train within one Integrated Master Schedule and the Systems Evolution Description, SV-8 will be evaluated as follows:

- a. The extent to which the IMS clearly represents all of the anticipated activities, work streams, deliverables, and milestones planned over the ACWS ID/IQ Ordering Period for the proposed solution/approach to meet the proposed schedule for Limited Deployment (LD), Initial Operational Capability (IOC), Full Deployment (FD) capability, and Full Deployment Decision (FDD) Program Milestones. The extent to which the IMS is comprehensive, realistic and feasible with consideration of the RFP requirements, the RFP Notional Schedule and is based on proven and mature processes (e.g., Established Industry Best Practices, CMMI, ISO or proven Corp Standards). An IMS that provides LD, IOC, and FD capability earlier than the Notional Schedule, while maintaining low risk, is preferred.
- b. The extent to which the IMS represents the details of Task Order 0001 activities over the period of performance for Task Order 0001 based on the SOO and the requirements of the RFP. A resource loaded IMS that provides the required activities for the Contractor and Government is preferred.
- c. The extent to which the graphical SV-8 is comprehensive, reflects a clear understanding of the RFP requirements, specifically, the representation of interfaces and is consistent with DoD Architecture Framework (DoDAF). An SV-8 that clearly reflects LD, IOC, and FD capability earlier than the Notional Schedule is preferred.

M.3.2.1.4 Solution Deployment, Training, Operations and Support

The submission of Offeror's methods and technical approach to Solution Deployment, Training, Operations and Support to CONUS and OCONUS locations will be evaluated as follows:

- a. The extent to which the Offeror's proposed approach and plan includes key activities for the System Integrator, the Software provider, and the Army Contracting Enterprise SMEs as related to system deployment, training and operations and support of the proposed solution are realistic, feasible and low risk. An approach in which the offeror has already demonstrates implementation of the proposed COTS-CWS core software to more than 1,000 users in Federal space is preferred.
- b. The extent to which the Offeror's approach provides configuration control of the proposed software solution in coordination with the Army for: operations, management of license/user access requirements and performance of maintenance/upgrades throughout the lifecycle of the solution.
- c. The extent to which the Offeror's approach for operations and support of the proposed solution effectively meets the system Operational Availability objectives (HLO-6). An operations and support approach based on already deployed COTS-CWS core software is preferred.
- d. The extent to which the Offeror's approach to Solution Deployment, Training, Help Desk, and Support meets the RFP requirements to include leveraging the use of the 300 Government SMEs and the Government Knowledge Management Portal. An approach that includes already developed deployment methods, solution specific training aides and help desk tools, based on already deployed COTS-CWS core software is preferred.
- e. The extent to which the Offeror's proposed approach to Software License Disclosure (provided in Attachment 0024) meets the requirements of the Army Contracting Enterprise and the objectives of the SOO and the RFP. The extent to which the Offeror's proposed licenses align to the ACWS Master Software License Agreement. The Government will use the evaluation of software acquisition risk factors utilizing the "DoD ESI COTS Software License Risk Assessment Tool" available at <http://www.esi.mil>. A License approach that provides the Government the ability to operate the software, maintain the proposed software licenses, configure the software solution, and after the Ordering Period ends, to competitively procure the ACWS solution is preferred.

For this volume all submissions in response to Section L.4.2.1 will be subject to a detailed cross reference with the OV-2_SV-1-Views (Attachment 0008), the ACWS Interface Development Strategy (Attachment 0010), the Offeror's Self Certification (Attachment 0027), the Offeror's Software Solution (Attachment 0028), the Integrated

Master Schedule, the Terms of Reference provided in the SOO, and the Requirements Traceability Matrix, as well as the Offeror's proposed PWS.

M.3.2.1.5 Technology Demonstration

The assessment of the Technical Demonstration will validate the Offeror's proposed technical capabilities as documented in the written proposal, and identify additional strengths, weaknesses and risks pertaining to the overall proposed technical solution, technical approach, technical schedule, solution deployment, training, operations and support (M.3.2.1.1 - .4).

M.3.2.1.5.1 Technology Demonstration Evaluation

The Government will confirm that at least one (1) of the "Key Personnel / Key Positions" proposed is a presenter. More than one "Key Personnel / Key Positions" participating is preferred.

The assessment of the contractor's demonstration of a preconfigured COTS product and/or components from an existing Federal user's active implementation(s) in the native, web-based architecture will include verification of: the ACWS Solution proposed, the preferred OOTB capability, the usability features and built-in training/help functions. Assessment of the ACWS Solution response to Script/Scenario (provided upon arrival to demonstration site).

1. Requirements Development.
2. Build Solicitation.
3. Source Selection.
4. Award.
5. Contract Administration.
6. Contract Closeout.
7. ACWS Solution Training.
8. Government Personnel/Usability.

M.3.2.2 Sub Factor 2 – Management Capabilities

M.3.2.2.1 Systems Engineering Management and Planning

The submissions of the Offeror's approach to Management of Systems Engineering, Design, Development, Test and Evaluation will be evaluated as follows:

- a. The extent to which the Management of Systems Engineering, Design, Development, Test, Evaluation, and Support Functions are proven, mature, complete, and feasible as related to RFP requirements.
- b. The extent the Offeror's experience and demonstrated ability to perform tasks that support the planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, controlling, and approval of Systems Engineering actions to accomplish overall ACWS program

objectives for system performance as related to RFP requirements. Proven and mature Systems Engineering Capabilities with the proposed solution software are most preferred.

M.3.2.2.2 Program Management

The submissions of the Offeror's approach to Program Management will be evaluated to the extent to which the Program Management, including the management of Cost, Schedule, Personnel, Communications, Risk, Quality, Documentation, Audit Readiness and Organizational Change are proven, mature, complete, and feasible as related to RFP requirements. Proven and mature capabilities currently operating in the Federal Government with the proposed software is most preferred.

M.3.2.2.3 Personnel Qualifications and Personnel Management

The submission of the Offeror's approach to Personnel Qualifications and Personnel Management will be evaluated as follows:

- a. The extent to which the approaches for recruiting, managing, and retaining a qualified and capable workforce that possesses the experience, education, certifications, clearances, and skills to support the entire scope described in the SOO are proven, complete and feasible as related to RFP requirements.
- b. The extent to which the approach to replace departed personnel with equally qualified personnel meets the process and timeframes specified in the SOO paragraph 6.1 Program Management.
- c. The extent the governance procedures include roles, responsibilities, accountability and clear lines of communication between the Contractor team and the Government for timely problem identification, mitigation and resolution. The extent to which the Offeror's ACWS Staff Levels and Skill Mix Schedule (Attachment 0015) reflects a clear understanding of RFP requirements, specifically, the understanding of and resources allocated for each task (by CLIN and by Task Order). The extent to which the labor category descriptions clearly state position requirements. The extent to which the Offeror identifies Key Personnel / Key Positions and the qualifications proposed for those positions. The extent to which the qualifications for the Offeror's identified positions are what the Government expects to be committed to the program of this size, scope and technical complexity.

M.3.2.3 Technical/Risk Ratings

The Government will use a combined Technical/Risk Rating in accordance with DoD Source Selection Procedures. Each Technical/Risk Subfactor will receive an Adjectival Rating which will then be combined into one singular overall Factor rating:

Combined Technical/Risk Ratings	
Adjectival Rating	Definition
Outstanding (Blue)	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Good (Purple)	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Acceptable (Green)	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal (Yellow)	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful contract performance is high.
Unacceptable (Red)	Proposal does not meet requirements, contains one or more deficiencies, and is unawardable.

M.3.3 Factor 2 – Past Performance

All assumptions will be reviewed for compliance with the ACWS requirements, feasibility and risk.

M.3.3.1 Past Performance as used in the Army Contract Writing System (ACWS) Request for Proposal (RFP) assesses the likelihood an Offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on the Offeror's record of recent and relevant performance.

M.3.3.1.1 The term "Offeror" refers to the prime Offeror and (if any) its subcontractors, teaming partners and Joint Ventures (JVs).

M.3.3.1.2 Recent Contract Performance: See Section L.4.3.1.4.1 of the ACWS RFP.

M.3.3.1.3 Relevant Contract Performance: See Section L.4.3.1.4.2 of the ACWS RFP.

M.3.3.1.4 The Government will consider the recency, relevancy, source and context of the past performance information it evaluates, along with general trends in performance, and demonstrated corrective actions. A significant achievement, problem/problem resolution or lack of relevant data in any element of the work performed can become an

important consideration in the evaluation process. A significant negative finding in any element may result in an overall lower confidence assessment rating.

M.3.3.1.5 Absent any recent and relevant past performance history, the Offeror will be assigned an unknown confidence (neutral) rating and its proposal will not be evaluated either favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

M.3.3.1.6 The Government may consider other past performance information and information regarding predecessor companies where such information is recent and relevant to the AWCS RFP.

M.3.3.2 The Government is not required to interview all points of contact identified by Offerors.

M.3.3.3 The Government reserves the right to consider any recent and relevant past performance that occurs after the solicitation closing date and prior to award. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to provide complete past performance information and thorough explanations as required by Section L.4.3. The Government is not obligated to make another request for the required information.

M.3.3.4 The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance will be assigned one of the following relevancy determinations:

Performance Relevancy Determination	
Rating	Definition
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.

M.3.3.5 The Offeror's Past Performance will be rated using the following ratings for Confidence:

Performance Confidence Ratings	
Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

M.3.3.6 The Offeror and its proposed subcontractors, team partners and JVs, if any, will be assessed individually, and the results will then be assessed in totality to determine the Offeror's Performance Confidence Rating based on demonstrated recent and relevant performance.

M.3.4 Factor 3 – Cost/Price

All assumptions will be reviewed for compliance with the ACWS requirements, feasibility and risk.

M.3.4.1 ACWS Price Matrix (Attachment 0020) and ACWS Additional Price Matrix (Attachment 0021) will sum CLINs 0001 thru 0015 to arrive at the Total Evaluated Price for that matrix. In the event of the Government identifies a Most Probable Cost (MPC) adjustment as determined IAW FAR 15.404-1(d) Cost Realism Analysis for all Cost CLINs (0003, 0004, and 0006), the MPC adjustment will be included in the Total Evaluated Price. A Total Evaluated Price will be calculated for the ID/IQ award and a separate Total Evaluated Price will be calculated for the additional source selection decision. The Government will evaluate prices to determine whether they are fair and reasonable IAW FAR 15.404-1. The Government expects adequate competition and a comparison will be made of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation. However, the USG reserves the right to require submission of certified cost or pricing data or data other than certified cost or pricing data from the offeror adequate to determine the reasonableness of an offer if competition was inadequate for that purpose.

M.3.4.2 The Total Evaluated Price will be evaluated, but will not be assigned a rating.

M.3.4.3 Proposals will be reviewed to identify any Unbalanced Pricing for all CLINs for which the Government did not provide a surrogate amount, in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(g), Unbalanced Pricing. A proposal may be rejected if the PCO determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

M.3.5 Factor 4 – Small Business Participation

M.3.5.1 Small Business Participation

All assumptions will be reviewed for compliance with the ACWS requirements, feasibility and risk.

Small Business Participation is evaluated in order to support the Government policy that Small Businesses be provided maximum practicable opportunities in Government acquisitions. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's Small Business Participation plan demonstrates the Offeror's commitment to maximizing opportunities for small businesses. The Government will consider both the degree to which an Offeror meets or exceeds any single socio-economic category, as well as the number of socio-economic categories an Offeror meets or exceeds. The government will consider two areas:

- a. Proposed Small Business Participation
- b. Commitment to Small Business

Definitions:

Participant, as used in this factor, includes the Offeror as well as any subcontractor.

Participation, as used in this factor, includes the work (dollars) performed by the Offeror, as well as the work (dollars) performed by subcontractors.

Requirement, as used in the adjectival ratings for this factor, is defined as a small business participation plan.

M.3.5.2 Proposed small business participation

The following objectives have been established for this procurement, based on total contract value:

- SB goal: 23%
- SDB goal: 5%
- WOSB goal: 5%
- HUBZone goal: 3%
- VOSB goal: 3%
- SDVOSB goal: 3%

- a. The Offeror's proposed percentage of participation (goals) identified in the Contract Participation Matrix will be evaluated against the Government's objective for each category. The Government will verify the size and socio-economic status for each small business subcontractor identified in the Contract Participation Matrix matches the subcontractors' written certification. For HUBZone-certified subcontractors identified in the Contract Participation Matrix, the Government will verify the Offerors evidence of HUBZone certification IAW FAR clause 52.219-8(d)(2).
- b. If the socio-economic status claimed in the matrix is not supported by the written certifications, the proposed percentages associated to the subcontractor for any unsupported category will be adjusted to zero. The government will not upwardly adjust the proposed percentages if the Offeror fails to claim credit for all categories. However, failing to claim credit for all categories may be viewed as not maximizing opportunities for small businesses.

M.3.5.3 Commitment to Small Business

- a. The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror commits to using small businesses in this procurement. An Offeror who proposes little to no participation for multiple socio-economic categories may be viewed by the Government as having a lack of commitment to small businesses.
- b. The Offeror's historical small business performance will be evaluated on the probability of compliance with the requirement based on its recent performance record in the area of small business utilization, with specific consideration given to the following:
 - i. Compliance with all terms and conditions of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns (when required on recent contracts). This shall include timely payments to Small Business subcontractors.
 - ii. Compliance with all terms and conditions of FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan (when required on the recent contracts), including actual small business utilization compared to small business subcontracting goals identified in the approved subcontracting plan for each recent contract that included a subcontracting plan. Offeror compliance with reporting requirements including ISR/Summary Subcontracting Reports (SSR). Offeror achievement on each individual goal stated within the subcontracting plan, to include a good faith effort if the goal was not achieved. If the offeror has no historical information, the proposal will be evaluated without regard to this paragraph.
- c. Additional documentation and explanations submitted in response to L.4.5 will be considered as part of the Offeror's commitment to small business.

M.3.5.4 The Government will develop one overall Small Business Participation rating for each Offeror based on the evaluation criteria described above and assign an adjectival Small Business Participation Rating from the table below.

Small Business Participation Ratings	
Rating	Definition
Outstanding (Blue)	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Good (Purple)	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Acceptable (Green)	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal (Yellow)	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful contract performance is high.
Unacceptable (Red)	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

M.4 DEFINITIONS

Adverse Past Performance - Past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating from sources where the information is from other than formal rating systems such as “PPIRS” or “FAPPIS.”

Finding - A “finding” is a “term of art” used in the Acquisition Source Selection Interactive Support Tool (ASSIST). A finding is the identification and documentation by the Government evaluation team of a specific individual aspect (positive or negative) of a proposal. It is accomplished by assessing the aspect (positive or negative) of a proposal against the Government’s requirements using the evaluation criteria as the measuring tools. The ASSIST provides capability for eleven different types of findings which are defined below.

Cost/Price Concern - A flaw, issue with, or lack of information in the cost/price proposal.

Deficiency - A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

Minor or Clerical Error (–): A minor non-cost/price factor informality or irregularity that is merely a matter of form and not of substance or a clerical error apparent on its face in the proposal.

Past Performance Relevancy Concern - An aspect of the proposal that raises a question about the relevancy of the Offeror's past performance information.

Significant Strength – An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance for capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Significant Weakness – A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Strength - An aspect of an Offerors' proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Terms and Conditions - An issue related to any of the solicitation provisions.

Weakness - A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Uncertainty - Any aspect of a non-Cost/Price Factor proposal for which the intent of the offer is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission or mistake).

M.5 Volume V – Contract Documentation

The content of this Volume will be reviewed to determine if it is compliant with and responsive to the terms and conditions of the RFP. Any deviations or non-compliances discovered in the compliance review may result in the proposal being rejected. The content of this Volume will not be included in the best value decision. The Government may incorporate selected information from the successful offeror's proposal, including information contained in Volume V, into the awarded contract.

***** END OF SECTION M NARRATIVE *****